CONFIDENTIAL

CITY OF SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL

CLOSED SESSION PROCEEDING

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT

AUGUST 2, 2005

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY CSR NO. 12478

1	PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF CLOSED SESSION PROCEEDINGS,
2	commencing at the hour of 5:24 p.m., on Tuesday,
3	August 2, 2005, at 202 C Street, 12th Floor, San Diego,
. 4	California, before Keren M. Guevara, Certified Shorthand
£ 5	Reporter in and for the State of California.
6	
7	APPEARANCES:
8	DEPUTY MAYOR TONI ATKINS
	SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL:
9	DISTRICT 1: SCOTT PETERS
	DISTRICT 2: (Vacant)
10	DISTRICT 3: TONI ATKINS
	DISTRICT 4: TONY YOUNG
11	DISTRICT 5: BRIAN MAIENSCHEIN
	DISTRICT 6: DONNA FRYE
12	DISTRICT 7: JIM MADAFFER
	DISTRICT 8: (Vacant)
13	
	ASSISTANT CITY LESLIE GIRARD
14	CITY ATTORNEY DON MCGRATH
	CITY MANAGER LAMONT EWELL
15	
	CHIP FLAHERTY
16	DAVID KLEINFELD
17	,
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	•
23	
24	
25	
	2
PE	TERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES
1	Alicher 2 2005 F.O.A.P. P. O.A.P. P.
	AUGUST 2, 2005, 5:24 P.M., SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
2	

the record before some of you came in, Item No. 2 and Item No. 6 I would merge my discussion.

This is last week's agenda.

MR. GIRARD: It's the same.

MR. MCGRATH: What's the SDCERS lawsuit number, Les?

MR. GIRARD: 2 and 6.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

15

16

17

20

21

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCGRATH: 2 and 6. I apologize.

9 What happened - and Mr. Peters, I heard your 10 comments. I was listening to the television, even 11 though I wasn't in the room.

MR. PETERS: We missed you.

13 MR. MCGRATH: I know. I would have loved to 14 have been there.

When you were gone on your recess, we determined that the three-year statute on 1090 would run on the Sunday before we filed this lawsuit.

Accordingly, we filed. We do not believe, as you said 18 in there, that we can wait for Bonnie Dumanis. 19

(Mr. Ewell enters the closed session room.)

MR. MCGRATH: We think the statute is three 22 years from the date of the event. Ergo, we moved as we did. We did not serve. We still haven't served. So that's what happened on that lawsuit,

MR. PETERS: And Grissom?

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

3 MS. ATKINS: I'm going to go ahead and call 4 the Closed Session meeting to order. 5 And for the record, we have District 1, 6 District 4, District 3, District 5, 6, and 7 are all 7 here. 8 And Mr. Girard, can you lead in telling us who 9. else is here? 10 MR. GIRARD: Yes. Assistant City Attorney, 11 Les Girard. 12 MR. MCGRATH: Assistant City Attorney, 13 Don McGrath. 14 MR. FLAGHERTY: Assistant City Attorney, 15 Chip Flagherty. 16 MR. KLEINFELD: David Kleinfeld, of Heller 17. Ehrman. 18 MS. ATKINS: Okay. Thank you very much. 19 Mr. McGrath, I think, for the record, we're 20 going to hold over Item No. 1, Brown Field Aviation, and 21 No. 7, California State University of Board Of Trustees.

1 MR. MCGRATH: After that, we came to you and 2 told you what we had done. After that, our opponents 3 demurred, and just so you kind of get a little flavor of 4 how much fun these people are - excuse me, I wouldn't 5 do this to you. Would you not? Come on. 6 MS. ATKINS: You guys, stop.

MR. EWELL: He's complementing you.

MS. ATKINS: Look, please, let's all pay attention, and let's hear Mr. McGrath.

Go ahead, sir.

MR. MCGRATH: A demurrer is a simple motion, normally. This is what they filed. They had to get permission from the Court. That is what I'm facing on the 23rd with these people.

Tomorrow morning - or last week, SDCERS decided to file it's own lawsuit, which is exactly the same as our cross-complaint in the case against Aguirre and the City, SDCERS. I don't know why they did it. Most of you seem to know more than I know because somehow everybody talks to everybody, but apparently, that's what they decided to do.

They now have a judge named Wickersham, and tomorrow morning all four unions are coming in in front of Judge Wickersham to intervene.

I haven't even talk to you about the lawsuit,

3

MR. MCGRATH: I will be as brief as I can.

And I would say to you, as I've said it off

And we're going to start with Item No. 2.

Go ahead, Mr. McGrath.

22

 $\angle 4$

let alone be retained or whatever we do on that. I'm not sure what I'm going to do tomorrow morning. I just may not go and then somebody can figure it out later. I don't know. But that's where I am.

2.3

24.

15-

What I would make -- what I would suggest, if you would let me, is that the judge I have presently, who is Judge Barton -- and that's the low number rule and should be the judge for the case, but somehow the court is not picking it up that way -- has been very good. Judge Wickersham is a nice man, but I don't know why we have to fight the same lawsuit over again in his court.

My position would be to consolidate, move to consolidate both actions, and send them to Judge Barton for trial. Now, that's basically it.

It's our opinion – and I just said something to Mr. Young that I've never said to you, but here's why I was hired. I'll tell you why I was hired. Every lawsuit is the same. 30 years of this, it's all the same. You file, you scream and yell, you scare each other, somebody thinks they're going to lose, and you settle.

Vive enlisted Judge Larry Irving, who is probably the finest settlement judge in the world. I mean, literally, he's doing Enron. And he's consented

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

1 to represent or to mediate our case for the City free of

to represent or to mediate our case for the City free of charge.

He is at the end of my rainbow. I would have expected to be with Mr. Aguirre for about a year. As it's going, I think I'll be here longer. But at some point, the unions are going to say, Gee, we might lose some benefits. And you all say, Gee, well, maybe we should pay some more, maybe through taxes or Lamont is going tax leases or whatever. I hope we don't sell real estate, but whatever you decided to do, we're all going go in front of somebody like Larry Irvine some day, and that's where I'm coming.

At present, I'm over -- I'm undermanned.

That's why I've asked to hire Heller Ehrman to help me.

And I'm asking you again.

We put the receiver at the end of our cross complain. It's a thing we should do, and I'll tell you why.

Somehow the board has lost the control of their rudder. They have within their walls bad people, people would have committed legal malpractice, accounting malpractice, brokerage malpractice, and actuarial malpractice.

How much is that worth? I don't know. Could be worth as much as a hundred million dollars, but

within those walls are the facts.

I can't get in there. They won't let me in.

They won't let Aguirre in. That's the lawsuit that they filed, the main lawsuit.

So as the time is going, the statute is running on those statutes, if it hasn't already run. That's the second reason I asked to hire Heller, and that's under—what would that be Les, 6?

MS. ATKINS: 2.

10 MR. GIRARD: No, your Honor. This is the 11 anticipated litigation, which is Tab 8.

MS. ATKINS: Oh, we're back to the book that you provided us to last week.

MR. MCGRATH: Yeah.

15 MS. ATKINS: Okay. Okay. Got it. I'm sorry.
16 MR. MCGRATH: It would be under Tab 6 today,
17 wouldn't it?

MR. GIRARD: No. I'm sorry, Your Honor. Let me – let me clarify. The cross-complaint is number – Closed Session Item No. 2.

The new lawsuit that Mr. McGrath has referred to by the CERS board challenging the legality or raising the issue of the benefits is under tabs — Closed Session Item No. 6.

The initiation of litigation which Mr. McGrath

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

has referred to against various professionals is listed under Closed Session Item No. 8, and that you would be authorizing of initiation or at least a report back on initiating litigation against the professionals that Mr. McGrath has mentioned.

So there are three items that were kind of discussing in here. Closed Session Item No. 2, Glosed Session Item No. 8, In the booklet that Mr. McGrath provided you last week there are various reports.

And if you look at tabs — Tab 2 is a report on the prospects for litigation against Gabriel Rodder and Smith.

Tab 1 is the prospects for litigation against

Callan & Associates. This is in the booklet provided by

Mr. McGrath last week. And I think that covers it.

MR. MCGRATH: And the receivership, then, we'll get onto that later on. That would be No. 4.

And I've done a more commonsensical memo on that, which I have sent via e-mail and asked you to insert in your notebooks. So that's where I'm coming from.

And I'm not capable of handling this litigation alone. The office just doesn't have that type of man – horsepower – excuse me, people power.

. •

Pretty simple. But, I don't have the wherewithal to hire Heller. I need to come to you.

Should we have ever filed the cross-complaint without your permission? It would have been nice to wait for you to come back, but I was scared to death we'd run that statute, and that's why I did it. No other reason.

MR. GIRARD: Your Honor, if I might just suggest perhaps an order of potential motions here for you because Mr. McGrath has identified a lot of issues that he needs your guidance on.

No. 1, I would point out that the issue of the legality of the benefits is absolutely joined now between the parties. And we would recommend strongly that you permit our office to proceed in the cross-complaint and defend against the new complaint using these offices of Heller Ehrman to assist Mr. McGrath in that effort.

That will result in a decision on the legality of these benefits one way or the other, which I think everybody needs. So that would be one motion.

Another potential motion to be to authorize -MS. FRYE: Mr. Girard. I'm sorry. If I

24 can -

2

3

14

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

 ~ 4

25

MS. ATKINS: Yes.

10

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

MS. FRYE: Just to keep things simple. MS. ATKINS: Ms. Frye. Go ahead. MS. FRYE: If you don't mind because I like

simple. I would move the motion, if you can just say it again. I would appreciate it:

MR. GIRARD: A potential motion would be to authorize the prosecution - the service and prosecution of the cross-complaint and a defense in the new action brought by the retirement board, which is Closed Session Item No. 6, and to retain Heller Ehrman to assist in that effort in an amount not to exceed - Mr. Kleinfeld, did you - I forgot if you proposed a budget for this, or was it an all inclusive budged?

MR. KLEINFELD: It was an all inclusive budget. I think it is behind - at least - I don't know what book you have in front of you today. It was, I believe, Item 4 on the -

MR. GIRARD: Let me suggest that actually the budget item would have to come before you in Open Session anyway. I believe Mr. Kleinfeld had noted a potential budget of half a million dollars for all services presently.

So this motion would be merely to prosecute the cross-complaint and defend against the new action and retain Heller Ehrman for that purpose. And we'll

bring forward the budgetary item for consideration in Open Session.

3 MS. ATKINS: Okav.

1

2

4

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FRYE: And I would move that.

5 MS. ATKINS: And for clarification -

6 MR, PETERS: I have a question. I have 7 questions.

MS. ATKINS: Okay. You have questions.

9 Ms. Frye has a motion.

10 Let me just make sure. You said that is 11 Item 6 on today's Closed Session docket?

12 MR. GIRARD: It would actually encompass part 13 of Item 2, Your Honor, which would be the prosecution of 14 the cross-complaint and a defense in Item No. 6 in the 15 action bought by CERS.

MS. ATKINS: Okay, For purposes of discussion, I'll second the motion.

Go ahead, Mr. Peters.

MR. PETERS: Okay. So we had a little bit of a decision on this before, but there's - Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the complaint had to do with the action which we approved last time, which was who's their counsel. We want to find that out. We agreed last time.

But 2 and 3 had to do with the validity of 25

MP-1 and the validity of MP-3. And then the rest of it

12

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

had to do with suing individuals for damages. We got 2 rid of the damages.

MR, MCGRATH: I'm sorry. I didn't bring you up to date.

MR. PETERS: Okay.

MR. MCGRATH: That issue, I meant to tell you, is really moot because we have been - even though we never served, these people have come in and asked for permission to demur, and they are demurring. One law firm on behalf of those named individuals as the SDCERS board.

MR. PETERS: Okay.

MR. MCGRATH: So that I think your fears should be - should go away on that issue.

15 MR. PETERS: All right. So I'm willing to 16 support Ms. Frye as to the declaratory relief on the 17 validity of the benefits.

Is that what you're suggesting?

Is that what your motion was?

MR. GIRARD: Correct. I just suggested a potential motion would be to pursue the cross-complaint. You can debate it and modify it as you deem appropriate.

MR. PETERS: I can support the declaratory

relief parts, but I can't support the rest of it at this point.

I don't know what I have in front of me, Les. I just can't, but I remember - I only have the first couple of pages. And I guess while you're looking for that, too, we also want to clarify that I'm concerned about the - I mentioned this last time, and I don't think Mike Aguirre had any problem with it, but I'm concerned about the risk of us being accused of bad faith bargaining if the City Council adopts the position that the benefits are that we just negotiated are illegal. And I think we should plead that it's the City Attorney that takes that position, not the City Council. MS. FRYE: Could I just get a clarification? MS. ATKINS: Yes, Ms. Frye. MS. FRYE: Thank you. That the benefits that we just approved -which benefits are you talking about? In 2002 or the ones most recently? MR. PETERS: I'm talking about 2002 and 2005. MS. FRYE: 2005? MR. PETERS: Yeah. I don't think it's that hard of an issue,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1-8-

19

20

21

22

25

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

the City Council believes that benefits are illegal

because I don't think that's - I don't think that's

Ms. Frye. I just don't want anyone to be pleading that

```
appropriate. I couldn't support that.
    MS. ATKINS: But you will -
```

MR. PETERS: I'm willing to authorize the City Attorney to state that he believes it and to prosecute the action on that basis, which would result in - it

would have the same result.

MS. FRYE: So what is the difference in part of my motion? I mean -

MR. MCGRATH: It is changing the name of the cross-defendant. Taking the City out and putting Aguirre in, with your blessing.

We've tried researchwise to come up with a way to have attorney be -- City Attorney be -- it's called ex rel. We're not terribly - we have not been successful in giving him a title that would make him equal to you as the City Council, but if you authorize that, it might work.

MR. PETERS: See, the thing is that they've pled in their action as Aguirre. So I think it should be okay. Right?

MR. MCGRATH: And he's there, and so are you. I could understand you're saying to us, We don't want to be a plaintiff or a defendant in their lawsuit. Maybe you'll have to be a defendant, but you don't want to prosecute setting aside the benefits which you - you have - you might have created in prior years. That's your point.

MR. PETERS: Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

action.

14

MR. MCGRATH: And I think it's well taken, I could go along with that, if it's legal to let Lazal? Mike Aguirre, City Attorney of San Diego - you know, and then we do a resolution authorizing him to bring that action. He would be that party in the

cross-complaint. Then we would merge the SDCERS case. I don't know what the end result may look like, but either way, the issue is coming up, and you're not a plaintiff trying to set aside benefits you might

13 have created, and I think Scott is legally correct. 14

That doesn't look good, and it probably isn't good. MS. ATKINS: Okay. Ms. Frye, are you -

MS. FRYE: I'm just going to keep listening until everyone is done talking. That's why I wanted to start with one motion and try and keep it simply because nothing is simple here anymore.

MS. ATKINS: And I'm going to go to Mr. Young, 21 but let me just clarify, since I seconded a motion, I 22 concur with Mr. Peters on that. I don't want to take a position where - I am in agreement because I don't want to - I don't want to be accused of bad faith bargaining either. I want the declaratory relief. I don't want

16

17

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

to -- you know, but I just -- so I may have to -- I seconded the motion, but --3 MS. FRYE: We can work on this.

4 MR. PETERS: I think that those people who 5 want the issue litigated have been helped a lot by the 6 fact that CERS has filed this complaint because now it's 7 joined. I think it takes away a lot of issues. I just 8 don't want us to be pleading that the City Council 9 believes that's these benefits are illegal, because I 10 think then that could expose the City to a problem we 11 don't need now, especially since they filled this

Do you have a copy of the complaint, Mr. Girard?

MR. MCGRATH: I have it.

MR. PETERS: Because my other comment had to do with the --

MR. MCGRATH: The rest of it.

Do you want my copy, or do you want me to read you the headings?

MR. PETERS: I have the headings. I just 22 don't have the rest. For some reason I have the first 23 four pages in my binder.

MR. GIRARD: It is actually copy of the first amended cross-complaint.

1	MR. MCGRATH: No, second amended.
2	MR. PETERS: I don't have that.
3	MR. MCGRATH: The second amended
4	cross-complaint, 1 is dec relief.
5	2 is dec relief.
6	3 is dec relief.
7	4 is dec relief, to which I understand you
8	don't object.
9	5 is breach of the trust.
10	6 is breach of fiduciary duty.
11	And this is mostly pled against the Sathoffs
12	and the people that really got us into this. This is -
13	they're defendants in those actions. Nobody to do with
14	the present board.
15	7, fraud and negligence.
16	8, fraud, intentional misrepresentation.
17	9, fraud and concealment.
18	10, negligence.
19	11, conspiracy.
20	12, writ of mandate.
21	And this is the way we get our result is we
22	ask the SDCERS board to restate the benefits, and then
23	instruct the City Auditor to go ahead and pay them.
24	It's just the methodology that we selected.
25	I can tell you most of this will probably be
	18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

 ≥ 4

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

24

25

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

butchered over the next few months, but that's what we've pled.

MR. PETERS: Well, I just -- my own personal view - and I'm interested in hearing everyone else's is I'm not interested in spending City money on the fraud and intentional concealment and all that stuff. I just don't think that that's important to us.

I think what we need is a resolution of whether the benefits are legal. And I'm just not interested in the rest of it.

MR. MCGRATH: Let me just say one thing to help you. It would be easy for you to tell me to drop the cross-complaint. I can't because that's where my statute is stopped. That's how I pled - why I pled when you were gone.

If I dropped the cross-complaint, I could blow the statute, which gives us the leverage to say maybe under 1090, 1092 we could void those benefits to just say forget about the complaint.

Let's go with the new lawsuit and be defendants. I don't want to agree to that, if you understand.

MR. PETERS: Can you get a tolling agreement on those?

MR. MCGRATH: A what?

```
7
           MR. PETERS: A tolling agreement.
 2
           MR. YOUNG: What's that?
 3
           MR. MCGRATH: I doubt it, not with these
 4
     people. There's no - there's hate.
 5
           MS. ATKINS: Explain for -
 6
           MR. PETERS: The idea is that I think what
 7
     Mr. - and I don't know the merits of this -
 8
     Mr. McGrath is saying, you only have so much time to
 9
     bring a claim for damage to recover from people.
10
           What he's saying is that the day he filed was
11
     at or near the last day he had to bring damages against
12
    these people to go after their personal assets to get
13
    money from them. And he saying that if we dismiss it.
14
    we won't be able to reinstate it so that it's timely.
15
           MR. MCGRATH: No. It's not my goal to get
16
17
```

their personal assets. My goal is to set aside the benefits under 1092, which says anything illegally constituted can be set aside civilly. And that's a three-year statute. That's what I'm trying to do.

Yes, there are some arguments that these people personally could be liable for damage. It's not my main goal.

MR. PETERS: So are you - when you're talking about your dismissing damage claims against all the 25 - board members -

20

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

1 MR. MCGRATH: Present. 2 MR. PETERS: - present board members, you 3 still have damage claims against -4 MR. MCGRATH: Sathoff and the others.

MR. PETERS: Yeah. See, for me, I don't know how much money we can recover from Ron Sathoff, He's going to protect his house. He's probably got a car. It's not worth it for me to do that.

To the extent that Mr. McGrath wants declaratory relief or wants to use those as a way to invalidate the benefits, I think that that can be done through declaratory relief.

You say that these people committed fraud, and therefore - so I'm not - I'm not sure. Maybe you could explain why we have to do that if we - I don't want to go personally after these people's personal assets.

MR. MAIENSCHEIN: On this point - do you mind 18 19 if I interject on this point?

20 MS. ATKINS: Go ahead. And then I want to get 21 to Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG: No. That's okay.

23 MS. ATKINS: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Maienschein.

MR. MAIENSCHEIN: Thank you.

Don, if I understood your response to

Mr. Peters, was that if you - if you could get the statute tolled - I mean, the reason you sort of filed this while the Council was on leg recess was to protect the statute, correct?

MR. MCGRATH: Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

20

21

22

25

MR. MAIENSCHEIN: And so if you could get a tolling agreement, would you be willing - I mean, in other words, would you be willing to write a letter to say that in the exchange - you know, I will dismiss this cross-complaint in exchange for a tolling agreement to protect the statute?

MR. MCGRATH: See, I don't think Sathoff and those people could answer that letter because they're under criminal indictment, so it wouldn't do any good.

I could do - if that is the only way to get your vote -- what Scott asked -- and get rid of the personal damages against them, plead the dec relief as we've pled, and retweak the thing so it would be an attempt to avoid, if you wanted MP-3.

I think in this room I would say MP-1 is probably dead because of statute, but we're just trying. It's our job.

So if you said to me, we don't want you suing Sathoff and those other people for dollars damages. We only want you to bring them for purpose of your dec

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

relief, which is a declaration that MP-1 and MP-2 are void, I would follow your instructions.

MR. MAIENSCHEIN: But I'm not sure I understand your response, though, on the tolling.

You don't think - why don't you think we could get a tolling agreement from the other side?

MR. MCGRATH: I think the other side is not the pension board. They can't control this. It's all the people who are being sued. Sathoff, the dirty sixes we call them, and they're not going to give me a tolling agreement because their criminal lawyers wouldn't let me.

And there's also an argument, and I'll tell you up front, I know the argument, that the statute may have run years ago. It may be a one-year statute. I don't know. I mean, you know, it's too risky.

On some of the professionals, when we get to 18 that subject, yeah, maybe they'd give me a tolling agreement because it's kind of normal, but I don't want to - even want to bother asking these people who are indicted.

MR. MAIENSCHEIN: Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair,

MR. PETERS: Can I just follow up.

MS. ATKINS: Thank you, Mr. Young. You're so

courteous.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

25

2.2

2 MR. PETERS: Just so you understand. The 3 breach of trust, for instance, the fifth cause of action against Grissom, Chapin, Sathoff, and Lexin, and so 4 5 forth, seems to be pled - this is paragraph 80 - As a 6 direct and proximate result of the actions, the City 7 suffered substantial loss of injury in the amount 8 according to prove at trial.

So that's just my concern is that it looks like these are all pled as a way to validate the benefit, and it would just be cleaner to rely on the general allegations of invalidity rather than go into personal assets.

MR. MCGRATH: It could be done.

MR. PETERS: Okay. So with those clarifications that's acceptable.

We're going to talk about the budget later because I had questions about that, but I'm okay with Ms. Frye's motions, if those clarifications are acceptable to her.

MS. ATKINS: Okay. Other comments, Mr. Young. MR. YOUNG: Just really quick, so I can make sure I'm clear, the purpose of the complaint, the cross-complaint, is really to determine if MP-1 and -2 are legal? Is that really what the purpose is, Don?

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

MR. MCGRATH: I apologize. I'm trying to catch a note from -

MR. YOUNG: That's all right.

Is that the purpose? The purpose of the cross-complain is to determine if MP-1, MP-2 are legal? That's really the - that's what we're really trying to get at?

MR. MCGRATH: Yes, sir.

MR. YOUNG: Now, isn't there another there's another complaint out there that was filed that has asked for the exact same thing.

MR. MCGRATH: That's correct. That was filed last week entitled SDCERS plaintiff versus the City of San Diego, in a separate cause of action assigned to Judge Wickersham.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. You don't believe that that will come to the same end? Would we get the same different ruling?

is it a different way of - I mean, we have to have two complaints for this?

21 MR. MCGRATH: No. I would move to consolidate 22 those two. And if Scott's motion carries, I would do it 23 on dec relief on the cross-complaint in this case. I'd 24 put them together.

One of the reasons I wanted to do that is I

23

have a judge that's a good judge. The judge they ended 2 up with is a nice man, but he's older than I am, and 3 that's older than dirt. Δ MR. PETERS: That's true. 5 MR. MCGRATH: To be honest with you. 6 MS. ATKINS: Typing. 7 But as a matter of correction, though, I think 8 it's Ms. Frye's motion, Mr. McGrath. 9 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, 10 MS. ATKINS: Go ahead, Mr. -11 MR. MCGRATH: He just wanted to amend it to 12 get rid of the damages. 13 MR. YOUNG: So the reason why we're just not 14 allowing that suit to go through and we're not filing 15 the suit is because you don't like the judge? 16 You don't think the judge would give us a fair 17 ruling? Is that what you're saying? 18 MR. MCGRATH: Kind of. 19 MR. YOUNG: So that's why you're asking us to 20 make this decision. 21 MR. MCGRATH: That's a reason. The second is 22 that when I pled in the cross-complaint. I pled timely 23 enough to stop the statute on the 1090, which would void 24 MP-1 and MP-2. 25 I think their lawsuit against us is after that 7 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 do? 10 MS. FRYE: If I may. 11 MR. YOUNG: Sure. 12 13

26 PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES fact, and we may not be able to get that relief. It's serious stuff. So what I do is smash them together, hopefully get the judge I like, and we're on our way. MR. YOUNG: Okay. And then the question is to the -- to my colleagues. And then, I wasn't here for those two decisions, but I mean, is that what you want to do? We want to file to find out if the decision that you actually made were legal? That's what you want to MS. FRYE: First of all, I don't think any of us were here in 1996. MR. YOUNG: Right. MS. FRYE: I could be wrong, but I don't remember any of us being on the Council and voting. Second of all, yes, if, in fact, the

18 information that the City Council members were given and remember, a lot of this, you know, like I said, you 20 were here, but you weren't here, you know, actually in the Closed Session - yeah, it would be nice to know.

14

15

16

17

19

21

22

24

25

MR. YOUNG: But the thing is, you're going to get that information anyway. I mean, it's already been filed though on your behalf.

MS. FRYE: Again, I'm not the attorney, but --

MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry. Donna, I just want to say this, I'm trying to take away the legal maneuvering and just kind of discuss this on a --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FRYE: I would prefer to have Mr. McGrath have the control. Plus, I think that the issue that he's raising is because of the timing of when certain actions were filed that it's necessary that he just keep his action moving forward because of the three-year statute - potential statute of limitations. That's that makes sense to me.

I don't want to rely on the CERS board any more than I have to, and quite frankly, I can't rely on them at all right now in order to do what I think is in the best interests of the City.

The other thing that could happen is they could drop that lawsuit at any time. There is no -there is nothing that requires them to move forward. In other words, we have absolutely no control over it.

If Mr. McGrath does it, at least we have – at least we have some level of control. And I'm tired of giving up the little bit of control we do have.

So that's why I think it's really important that we let them follow the legal strategy they think is 24. best on this particular instance. I just feel comfortable with it, and I can - we can figure out the

28

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

1 motions, if you want to amend it afterwards, to make 2 Mr. Peter's --

MR. PETERS: I'll say it again.

MS. ATKINS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Just one more question about the new complaint.

There's a new complaint that you mentioned. What exactly is that, or -

MR. MCGRATH: The one that they filed --SDCERS filed against the City?

MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

MR. MCGRATH: That's entitled Complaint for Dec Relief, and it's basically - a dec relief says, you say I say who's right. That's kind of what you do.

You're throwing up your hands saying, Judge, tell me what - and they give you our side and their side. Of course, their side is they want it to be okay and we don't.

But it's the same exact thing that we've already pied in the cross-complaint. I don't know why they did it. I've read their minutes. I don't know why they do anything over there. It may be because they didn't like the rulings they're getting from this other judge. They figure you won't okay my cross-complaint because I didn't ask your permission or something.

You know, they know more about us than we know about them and visa versa. I don't know what they're up to, but that could be. They may think, Ah-ha, the Council is going to tell this dope to drop that lawsuit. Then I blow the statute on the 1090. And I have to play it their way with their judge, and that's - I hope not to have to ever do that.

7

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18-

19

20

21

22

z 4

3

MR. YOUNG: Okay. That makes sense.

Just a couple other questions. In plain English, other than the fact, you know, of what we just talked about, what are the other basic elements from not from a legal description, but what are the other basic elements of this cross-complaint?

MR. MCGRATH: Well, as it's pled now or the way Scott would like it pled?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand what Scott - I know what his amendments were, and I understand what his discussions were.

MR. MCGRATH: Okay. A dec relief is merely, I say it's legal. You say it's not.

Our side of it is, the prior Council on MP-1 gave away benefits with no funding. That's pretty serious, and we say the same on 2002.

And that's what those people have been indicted for. Under 1090 that's a criminal action. If have retired, who have made their - you know, their plans, their life-long plans, and now all of a sudden we're saying that you can't have them anymore. And that's - I think that's an ethical question that we also have to determine.

there are certain benefits that these individuals who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

30

Yes, this is a means to figure out if we can get rid of benefits because it's - you know, it's a burden to us. It's making us make tough budgetary decisions. It's difficult decisions that we have to make because of our fiscal situation.

But we also have to consider those retirees who are on fixed incomes, and so that's the other side of this. And so I'm not -- you know, I'm not really sure where to go with that.

MR. MCGRATH: Well, I could just tell you that we've analyzed it upside down. I mean, that's all I've been doing since I've been here.

There's not going to be enough money for the people that -- Mr. Flagherty's age, the young man behind me, who is a deputy. There will be enough money in the next, say, 12, 15, 20 years to pay for them ever. I don't know what a Court will do.

I'm going to tell you my legal opinion, my not legal - my street law opinion is a judge is going to be

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

that's correct, then those things could be voided.

I'll tell you, the unions will tell you that's wrong, and I'm crazy and everything else, but that's what the unions are there for, to protect their side.

MR. YOUNG: Is that a part of the complaint, the part where it could be voided?

MR. MCGRATH: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: That's it's voided?

MR. MCGRATH: Yes. It's in the - it's in the first part where you tell your facts. It says at page 9, Manager's Proposal 1, and then I explain what happened there.

And then Manager's Proposal 2 at page 11, and then what I do is incorporate that whole part, and I say, cross-complainants incorporate by reference and realize paragraphs 1 through 61, and I plead for Dec Relief 1.

Dec Relief 2, I incorporate all that or dec relief under the cause of action. That's the way we do

MR. YOUNG: And I guess the question to my colleagues would be, you know, I guess there is a question in my mind. Okay. It could have been an illegal act. I don't know. I don't know if these 25 were - it was made under illegal basis, but you know, PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

hard pressed to hurt somebody that's already out there. 2 The whole thing is going to go in a big room just like 3 this with the unions yelling, and we're going to 4 renegotiate the whole darn thing.

You want a bet? I can't bet, but you would say that's about a 60, 70 percent chance at some point that could happen.

MR. YOUNG: So it could be a finding that they were -- it was determined illegal, but the benefits still stay, or -

MR. MCGRATH: Could be. Could be any way you want it. I'm talking about -

MR. YOUNG: I mean, a judge could do that, right?

MR. MCGRATH: He could do it.

MR. YOUNG: Or she could make that decision,

MR. MCGRATH: But I'm thinking you'll settle

it. I think you'll come up with an idea with Lamont taxing this or that. You know, raising - I don't know how you raise taxes, whatever you do.

There will someday be enough money to pay a ' logical, legal pension benefit to everybody - not me and not Lamont because we cut ourselves out - but to people who are coming through the ranks.

That's the hardest argument we have with

police officers and such. They don't get it. "We're entitled to retroactive." Sure we are. There's no money. How you going to get it? Where you going to get it?

So we do it through litigation and we kind of squeeze everybody until somebody budges, and then we give. We take. We give. We take. That's where I'm hoping we'll go. Otherwise, I wouldn't have come back out of retirement.

MR. YOUNG: I understand.

z4

MR. GIRARD: Your Honor? Yes, a quick follow to what Mr. McGrath thought and just follows from Mr. Peter's comment about unfair labor practices.

The determination — in our opinion, based upon the research we've done, the determination whether or not the benefits are legal or illegal doesn't necessarily lead to a conclusion that there's been bad faith bargaining. The law — the law generally says that if a benefit — benefits can be taken away, provided that something of similar or equal value is given.

So when all of this is said and done, if the Court finds that the benefits are illegal, they're illegal.

The question of whether you're bargaining in

voted on something illegal. I don't think it was illegal.

And I'm also – you know, just for the record,
I think that the legal theory is novel that because you
don't have a funding source it's illegal. Now, I
understand that there's – a lot research has gone into
it, but if I hire a roofer who fixes my roof, and I
can't say, you know, "When I made the contract with you
I didn't have the money to pay for it, so it was
illegal."

And so I think it's a challenge, but let me just say that I think that it's also – it's a very real thing that people are out there in the public, you know, giving tremendous credence to this Third Interim Report. We've got to know the answer.

So I think it was a blessing that the Retirement Board sued the City, and said they wanted declaratory relief. So let's find the answer.

But let me say where I differ a little bit is I want the answer. I don't want to do — I don't want to do a year litigation and spend half a million dollars, which could be a million dollars doing a bunch of depositions just to delay the answer.

My goal would be that we actual try to get to the Court pretty soon, and get a ruling because I want

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

good faith or dealing with your employees or retirees in good faith will depend upon what you do in light of that declaration. And so I think Mr. McGrath is correct. A determination is either on it's way or gets made, and then everybody goes in a room and figures out how to deal with the situation.

So I think that's far enough down the road, and what you really need — and I know the City Attorney would say that the funding for these benefits is probably the single biggest component of the unfunded liability. And so he would urge that you at least start down the road to try to get a decision on whether these are valid or not. And then — and then, hopefully, people will come to the table, and we'll figure out a way to solve it.

MS. ATKINS: Mr. Peters.

MR. PETERS: All right. I just want to say, to follow on Mr. Young, and I hate to take too much time, but it's a pretty significant thing we're doing here.

I don't want — the reason I said I wanted it to be the name of the City Attorney is I don't want my name on anything that says that I think these benefits are illegal. I don't think they're illegal. So I just — I just don't want to be pleading that I think I the answer.

And I don't see this — you know, I know, you know in previous lives that sometimes litigation was a tool to get you to the table, and there's always that part of it. But you know, I want it talk about things like stipulating to interventions, stipulating to facts.

I don't want, you know, Dave here to be spending a lot of money doing depositions that, Is this document true and accurate, when a lot of that stuff should be agreed to. It's public money we'll be spending on both sides.

So, just, you know, although I would love to see a resolution where we sat down and talked, I don't want the litigation to be used as some sort of hammer to get us to the table. I really would like to see a resolution of it because it's out there, and the public has a legitimate question about whether these things are

legal. I think we should answer the question.

So, you know, that's why, you know, my

So, you know, that's why, you know, my motion is to do this in the least mean way we can, which is to just do the declaratory relief, but to get on the problem, answer – answer the question that CERS has now put to us to say that it's the City Attorney who has declared that this is an illegal benefit, but at least not to necessarily say that the City Council says one

way or the another because Ms. Frye and I may have a different opinion about that, but not to say it all.

And when we talk about the budget, I think we ought to be talking about things like how to make it go more smoothly and more cheaply so we can get a resolution of this. And I would like - I would like to get to the answer. I'd like to do it soon.

MS. ATKINS: Okay. Ms. Frye, in terms of your motion, since I seconded it, can we just get some clarification.

MS. FRYE: Yeah. Let's see if we can work with Mr. Girard and Mr. McGrath and have them assist me in putting together a motion and seeing if that works.

MR. MCGRATH: I'm incompetent. I'm a litigator. That's his job.

MR. GIRARD: Well, let me start with what the motion was, and then what we need to do is clarify what Mr. Peters would like to amend to that motion, and then see if you agree.

MS. FRYE: Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

<u>"</u>3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

-1-8-

19

20

21

2.2

25

MR. GIRARD: The motion was to prosecute the cross-complaint, to defendant the companion action, the new case, and retain Heller Ehrman for purpose.

MS. FRYE: Right.

MR. GIRARD: And then Mr. Peters requested

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

that the cross-complaint be generalized, be trimmed down such that the action reflects a dispute by the City Attorney with respect to these issues, and we - and it's merely declaratory relief only, and we're not seeking damages or penalty against named individuals.

Mr. McGrath is that -

MR. MCGRATH: Yes. To be safe, I'd like a resolution from the Council which authorizes the City Attorney to do it.

MR. PETERS: Okay.

MR. GIRARD: But that would be the motion if the maker of the motion is okay with that.

MS. FRYE: Is that -

MR. PETERS: Sorry, just to confirm.

MS. FRYE: - what you're wanting?

MR. PETERS: Also, we decided at the last 17. meeting that the issue of receiver is coming back to us after the hearing on the demurrer. And so to the extent that that's - I don't want that necessarily taken out of the cross-complaint, but we're not taking an action on that today.

MR. GIRARD: Well, let's deal with that separately, if we may. This is solely on the issue of the validity of the benefit.

MR. PETERS: Just so you know, the reason I'm

saying that is that one of the remedies pled for is the receiver. And we've decided already to put that off until after the demurer. We learned that.

MR. GIRARD: And for the record, Your Honor, the other thing was previously you authorized the City Attorney to pursue the question in the cross-complaint about who's the lawyer for the CERS board.

That's in the cross-complaint, and the City Attorney will proceed with that issue, based upon your prior direction. That was either last week or the week before.

MS. ATKINS: Okay. So let me just make sure. 13 Ms. Frye, are you okay with the motion as stated? MS. FRYE: Yes.

15 MS. ATKINS: As am I, the seconder of the 16 motion.

Mr. Maienschein and then Mr. Madaffer.

18 MR. MAJENSCHEIN: Thank you.

Les, did I hear you also include Mr. Peters' point about taking the names of the Council off?

MR. GIRARD: That was included in the comment that it would be trimmed to make clear that the dispute is between the City Attorney with respect to this, which would involve amending the caption, I assume, Mr. McGrath.

25

1

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

38

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

1 MR. MCGRATH: Yeah. God bless us all. 2 MR. MAIENSCHEIN: And then, secondly, I didn't 3 hear a cost. We haven't gotten to that yet. 4 Thank you.

MS. ATKINS: Mr. Madaffer.

MR. MADAFFER: I've been listening to all this, and I'm just curious.

Today, sitting in the City Council meeting, I found out that the City Attorney released at 12 o'clock noon to the public and members of the media the Kroll documents that were subject to the attorney-client privilege waiver discussion last night.

While on the surface that might make sense, I thought - and I've asked to get a copy of the tape - I thought I heard the City Attorney say yesterday, perhaps it was Mr. Girard, that made a statement on the record that seemed to indicate that it might not necessarily make sense that those documents be released to the media, since there was an ongoing investigation.

MS. ATKINS: Mr. - can I just ask, is this related to this item?

MR. MADAFFER: Yeah. I'm getting to it. MS. ATKINS: Okav.

24 MR. MADAFFER: I'm so sorry. I've just been 25 sitting here listening. I appreciate that.

So that being said, I'm not going to vote for this today sitting in here because as much as I support the spirit of it and I think you've got some good compromise going on, I'm really all of a sudden just kind of not really trusting anything that's being said. I mean, I know that part of this includes a resolution with respect to receivership, and I still have a lot of unanswered questions on that, more questions since I got the binder. So I'm just really not confident that what I'm voting on is what I'm getting. MR. MCGRATH: Well, I think you've known me for a number of years, and I'm going to give you what you ask for. MR. MADAFFER: I trust you. MS. ATKINS: Thank you. So we have a motion and a second. I'd like to - no further comments? Call for any question. And all those in favor say "Aye." MR. PETERS, MR. YOUNG, MS. ATKINS, MR. MAIENSCHEIN, MS. FRYE: Aye. MS. ATKINS: Opposed. MR. MADAFFER: No. MS. ATKINS: Passes 5-1 with District 7 in

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO) STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

I, Keren M. Guevara, Certified Shorthand
Reporter licensed in the State of California,
License No. 12478, Registered Professional Reporter,
hereby certify that the deponent was by me first duly
sworn and the foregoing testimony was reported by me
and was thereafter transcribed with Computer-Aided
Transcription; that the foregoing is a full, complete,
and true record of said proceeding.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day:

KEREN M. GUEVARA, CSR, RPR

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

opposition.

(Whereupon the discussion on this subject was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.)

 $\frac{17}{18}$

·21

A	29:1 38:18	Associates 9:15	Barton 6:7,15	bought 12:15
able 20:14 2		assume 40:24	based 34:14	breach 18:9,10
absolutely 1	′.1 ,0,1,0	ATKINS 2:8,10	40:9	24:3
28:18	amending 40:24	3:3,18 5:6,8	basic 30:11,13	BRIAN 2:11
acceptable	amendments	8:9,12,15	basically 6:15	brief 3:24
24:16.20	30:17	10:25 11:2	29:13	bring 12:1 13:3
•		12:3,5,8,16	basis 15:5 31:25	16:7 20:9,11
accounting accurate 37:	, , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	14:14 15:2	behalf 13:10	22:25
accurate 37.		16:15,20 20:5	27:24	brokerage 7:22
16:24	answer 22:13	21:20,23 23:25	believe 4:18	brought 11:9
act 31:24	36:15,18,20,23	24:21 26:6,10	11:17,20 25:16	Brown 3:20
action 11:8,2	27 1 10 22 22	29:4 35:16	believes 14:24	budged 11:13
12:15,21 1	20.5	38:8 40:12,15	15:4 17:9	budges 34:6
15:19 16:8	3.3	41:5,20,23	benefit 24.11	budget 11:12,15
17:12 24:3		42:16,21,23,25	33:22 34:19	11:19,21 24:17
25:14 28:8	00.4	attempt 22:19	37:24 39:24	38:3
30:25 31:1	1	attention 5:9	benefits 7:7 8:23	budgetary 12:1
38:22 39:2	1 1 1 1 1 1	attorney 2:14	10:13,20 13:17	32:9
actions 6:14	apologize 4:8	3:10,12,14	14:10,16,17,24	bunch 36:22
18:13 24:6	25:1	14:11 15:4,13	15:25 16:12	burden 32:9
28:7	apparently 5:20	15:13 16:6	17:9 18:22	butchered 19:1
actual 36:24	APPEARAN	27:25 35:8,22	19:9,18 20:17	batterer ed 19.1
actuar 30:24		37:23 39:3,9	21:11 30:22	C
actualiai 7.2		40:6,9,23 41:9	32:1,8 33:9	C2:3
adopts 14:9	41:25	41:15 44:15	34:16,19,23	California 1:13
age 32:20	appropriate	attorney-client	35:9,23	2:4,5 3:1,21
agenda 4:3	13:22 15:1	41:11	best 28:14,24	44:4,7
ago 23:15	approved 12:22	Auditor 18:23	bet 33:5,5	call 3:3 23:10
agree 19:21	14:16	August 1:12 2:3	big 33:2	42:19
38:19	argument 23:13	3:1	biggest 35:10	Callan 9:15
agreed 12:23	20 14 22 25	authorize 10:22	binder 17:23	called 15:13
37:10	arguments	11:7 15:3,16	42:9	capable 9:23
agreement	20:20	authorized 40:5	bit 12:19 28:21	caption 40:24
16:23 19:23	1	authorizes 39:8	36:19	44:16,17
20:1 22:7,1	1 16 10 00 16 10	authorizing 9:3	bless 41:1	car 21:7
23:6,11,19	asked 7:14 8:7	16:7	blessing 15:11	carries 25:22
Aguirre 5:17		Aviation 3:20	36:16	case 5:17 6:8 7:1
8:3 14:7 15	'''	avoid 22:19	blow 19:16 30:5	16:9 25:23
15:19 16:6	41:14	Aye 42:20,22	board 3:21 7:19	38:23
ahead 3:3,23			8:22 11:9	eatch 25:2
5:10 11:2	23:20 26:19	В	13:11 18:14,22	cause 24:3 25:14
12:18 18:23		back 8:12-9:3	20:25 21:2	31:19 44:17
21:20,23 20	01.470.40	10:5 34:8	23:8 28:11	CERS 8:22
Ah-ha 30:3	assigned 25:14	39:17	36:17 40:7	12:15 17:6
allegations	assist 10:17	bad 7:20 14:8	Bonnie 4:19	28:11 37:22
24:12	11:10 38:12	16:24 34:17	book 8:12 11:16	40:7
allowing 26:		bargaining 14:9	booklet 9:9,15	certain 28:6
amend 26:11	1 · [I	1 7777	
1 9 m en a 76 1 1	3:10,12,14	16:24 34:18,25	bother 23:20	32:1

CERTIFICA	31:22	confident 42:10	cross 7:16	27:7 33:16
44:1	come 5:5 10:2.5	CONFIDENT	cross-complain	35:12
Certified 2:4	11:19 13:8	1:1	25:5	decisions 27:6
44:6	15:12 25:17	confirm 39:14	cross-complai	32:10,10
certify 44:9,14	33:18 34:8	consented 6:25	31:15	declaration 23:1
Chair 23:23	35:14	consider 32:12	cross-complaint	35:3
challenge 36:11	comfortable	consideration	5:17 8:19 10:3	declaratory
challenging 8:22	28:25	12:1	10:16 11:8,24	13:16.23 16:25
chance 33:6	coming 5:23	consolidate 6:13	12:14 13:21	21:10,12 36:18
changing 15:9	7:12 9:21	6:14 25:21	16:9 17:25	37:21 39:4
Chapin 24:4	16:11 33:24	conspiracy	18:4 19:13,16	declared 37:24
charge 7:2	39:17	18:19	22:10 24:24	deem 13:22
cheaply 38:5	commencing 2:2	constituted	25:23 26:22	defend 10:16
Chip 2:15 3:15	comment 17:16	20:18	29:20,24 30:13	11:24
City 1:9,9 2:8,13	34:13 40:21	contract 36:8	38:22 39:1,20	defendant 15:23
2:14,14 3:10	comments 4:10	control 7:19	40:6,8	15:24 38:22
3:12,14 5:18	24:21 42:18	23:8 28:5,18	cross-defendant	defendants
7:1 14:9,11,12	committed 7:21	28:20,21	15:10	18:13 19:21
14:24 15:3,10	21:13	copy 17:13,19	CSR 1:24 44:22	defense 11:8
15:13,16 16:6	commonsensic	17:24 41:14	curious 41:7	12:14
17:8,10 18:23	9:19	correct 13:20	cut 33:23	delay 36:23
19:5 24:6	companion	16:13 22:4		demur 13:9
25:13 27:18	38:22	25:12 31:1	D	demurer 40:3
28:14 29:10	complain 7:17	35:3	damage 20:9,21	demurred 5:3
35:8,22 36:17	complaint 10:16	correction 26:7	20:24 21:3	demurrer 5:11
37:23,25 39:2	12:21 17:6,13	cost 41:3	damages 13:1,2	39:18
39:8 40:5,8,23	19:19 24:23	Council 1:9 2:8	20:11 22:17,24	demurring 13:9
41:8,9,15	25:10 29:6,7	14:9,12,24	26:12 39:5	depend 35:2
civilly 20:18 claim 20:9	29:12 31:5	15:16 17:8	darn 33:4	deponent 44:9
	complaints	22:3 27:16,18	date 4:22 13:4	depositions
claims 20:24 21:3	25:20	30:4,21 37:25	Dave 37:7	36:23 37:8
clarification	complementing	39:8 40:20	David 2:16 3:16	deputy 2:8
12:5 14:13	5:7	41:8	day 7:11 20:10	32:21
38:10	complete 44:12	counsel 12:22	20:11 44:19	description
clarifications	component	44:14	dead 22:21	30:12
24:16,19	35:10	COUNTY 44:3	deal 35:6 39:22	determination
clarify 8:19 14:5	compromise	couple 14:3 30:9	dealing 35:1	34:14,15 35:4
16:21 38:17	42:4	course 29:17	death 10:5 debate 13:22	determine 24:24
cleaner 24:11	Computer-Ai	court 5:13 6:9		25:5 32:6
clear 24:23	44:11	6:12 32:23	dec 18:4,5,6,7	determined 4:16.
40:22	concealment	34:23 36:25	22:17,25 25:23	33:9
closed 1:10 2:1	18:17 19:6	courteous 24:1	29:13,13 30:19	Diego 1:9,13 2:3
3:4 4:20 8:20	concern 24:9	covers 9:16	31:16,18,18 decided 5:16.21	2:8 3:1 16:6
8:23 9:2,7,7,8	concerned 14:5	crazy 31:3	decided 5:16,21 7:10 39:16	25:14 44:3
11:9 12:11		created 16:1,13	40:2	differ 36:19
27:21	conclusion 34:17	credence 36:14	decision 10:19	difference 15:7
colleagues 27:5		criminal 22:14	12:20 26:20	different 25:18
concagues 27.3	concur 16:22	23:11 30:25	14.20 20.20	25:19 38:2
		! 	ŀ	

difficult 20-10	7.14.10.17		2.15	N 0446
difficult 32:10 direct 24:6	7:14 10:17	F	2:15	generally 34:18
direction 40:10	11:10,25 38:23	facing 5:13	flavor 5:3	getting 29:23
dirt 26:3	either 16:11,25	fact 17:6 27:1,17	Floor 2:3	41:22 42:11
	35:4 40:10	30:10	follow 23:2,24	Girard 2:13 3:8
dirty 23:9 discuss 28:3	44:15	facts 8:1 31:10	28:23 34:11	3:10,11 4:4,7
1	elements 30:11	37:6	35:18	8:10,18 10:8
discussing 9:7	30:13	fair 26:16	follows 34:12	10:23 11:6,18
discussion 4:2	else's 19:4	faith 14:8 16:24	foregoing 44:10	12:12 13:20
12:17 41:12 43:3	employees 35:1	34:18 35:1,2	44:12,16	17:14,24.34:11
discussions	encompass	far 35:7	forget 19:19	38:12,16,21,25
30:18	12:12	favor 42:20	forgot 11:12	39:11,22 40:4
dismiss 20:13	ended 26:1	fears 13:13	forth 24:5	40:21 41:16
22:9	English 30:10	feel 28:24	forward 12:1	give 23:10,18
· .	enlisted 6:23	fiduciary 18:10	28:8,17	26:16 29:16
dismissing 20:24	Enron 6:25	Field 3:20	found 41:9	34:7,7 42:13
dispute 39:2 40:22	enters 4:20	fifth 24:3	four 5:23 17:23	given 27:18
	entitled 25:13	fight 6:11	frankly 28:12	34:21
District 2:9,9,10	29:12:34:2	figure 6:3 28:25	fraud 18:15,16	gives 19:17
2:10,11,11,12	equal 15:16	29:24 32:7	18:17 19:6	giving 15:15
2:12 3:5,6,6,6	34:20	35:14	21:13	28:21 36:14
42:25	Ergo 4:22	figures 35:5	free 7:1	go 3:3,23 5:10
docket 12:11	especially 17:11	file 5:16 6:20	front 5:23 7:11	6:3 7:11 11:2
document 37:9	estate 7:10	27:7	11:16 14:1	12:18 13:14
documents	ethical 32:5	filed 4:17,18	23:14	16:5,20 18:23
41:11,18	event 4:22	5:12 8:4 10:3	Frye 2:11 10:23	19:20 20:12
doing 6:25 32:18 35:19 36:22	everybody 5:20	17:6 20:10	11:1,2,3 12:4,9	21:16,20,23
37:8	5:20 10:21	22:2 25:10,12	13:16 14:13,14	24:12 26:10,14
dollars 7:25	33:22 34:6	27:24 28:7	14:15,20,23	32:15 33:2
11:21 22:24	35:5	29:9,10	15:7 16:15,16	34:8 38:4
1	Ewell 2:14 4:20	filing 26:14	17:3 27:10,12	goal 20:15,16,22
36:22,22 Don 2:14 3:13	5:7	filled 17:11	27:15,25 28:4	36:24
· ·	ex 15:14	find 12:23 27:7	38:1,8,11,20	God 41:1
21:25 24:25 Damma 2:11 28:1	exact 25:11	36:18	38:24 39:13,15	goes 35:5
Donna 2:11 28:1	29:19	finding 33:8	40:13,14 42:22	going 3:3,20,22
dope 30:4	exactly 5:16	finds 34:23	Frye's 24:19	6:2,21 7:5,6,9
doubt 20:3	29:8	finest 6:24	26:8	7:10 8:5 16:16
drop 19:12	exceed 11:11	firm 13:10	full 44:12	16:20 21:7
28:16 30:4	exchange 22:9	first 14:2 17:22	fun 5:4	23:10 24:17
dropped 19:16	22:10	17:24 27:12	funding 30:22	27:22 30:4
duly 44:9	excuse 5:4 9:25	31:10 44:9	35:9 36:5	32:19,24,25
Dumanis 4:19	expected 7:4	fiscal 32:11	further 42:18	33:2,3 34:3,3
duty 18:10	explain 20:5	fixed 32:13	44:14	42:1,4,13
E	21:15 31:11	fixes 36:7	G	good 6:10 16:14
easy 19:12	expose 17:10	Flagherty 3:14		16:14 22:14
effort 10:18	extent 21:9	3:15	Gabriel 9:12	26:1 35:1,2
11:11	39:18	Flagherty's	Gee 7:6,7	42:3
Į.	e-mail 9:20	32:20	general 24:12	gotten 41:3
Ehrman 3:17		FLAHERTY	generalized 39:1	Grissom 4:25
	I	Ì		

24:4	hour 2:2	18:16 19:6	44:22	19:9 24:25
guess 14:4 31:21	house 21:7	interested 19:4	kind 5:3 9:6	25:5 27:8 28:2
31:22	hundred 7:25	19:5,10 44:17	23:19 26:18	28:23 30:12,20
Guevara 2:4	hurt 33:1	interests 28:14	28:3 29:14	32:24,25 33:22
44:6,22		Interim 36:14	34:5 42:5	34:16 36:4
guidance 10:11	I	interject 21:19	Kleinfeld 2:16	37:18
guys 5:6	idea 20:6 33:18	intervene 5:24	3:16,16 11:11	legality 8:22
	identified 10:10	interventions	11:14,20	10:13,19
H	illegal 14:10,24	37:6	know 4:13 5:18	legally 16:13
half 11:21 36:21	17:9 31:24,25	invalidate 21:11	5:19,19 6:4,10	legitimate 37:17
hammer 37:14	33:9 34:16,23	invalidity 24:12	7:24 11:16	Les 3:11 4:6 8:8
hand 44:18	34:24 35:24,24	investigation	14:1 16:6,10	14:1 40:19
handling 9:23	36:1,2,5,10	41:19	17:1 20:7 21:5	LESLIE 2:13
hands 29:15	37:24	involve 40:24	22:9 23:14,16	letter 22:8,13
happen 28:15	illegally 20:17	Irvine 7:11	23:16 27:19,20	let's 5:8,9 19:20
33:7	important 19:7	Irving 6:23	27.21 29:20,21	36:18 38:11
happened 4:9,24	28:22	issue 8:23 10:12	30:1,1,1,2,10	39:22
31:12	include 40:19	13:6,14 14:22	30:17 31:22,24	level 28:20
hard 14:22 33:1	included 40:21	16:11 17:5	31:24,25 32:2	leverage 19:17
hardest 33:25	includes 42:6	28:5 39:17,23	32:8,14,23	Lexin 24:4
hate 20:4 35:18	inclusive 11:13	40:9	33:19,19 35:8	liability 35:11
headings 17:20	11:14	issues 10:10	36:3,8,13,15	liable 20:21
17:21	incomes 32:13	17:7 39:3	37:2,2,3,5,7,12	License 44:8
hear 5:9 40:19 41:3	incompetent	item 3:20,22 4:1	37:19,19 39:25	licensed 44:7
heard 4:9 41:15	38:14	4:2 8:20,24 9:2	42:6	life-long 32:3
3	incorporate	9:7,8,8 11:10	known 42:12	light 35:2
hearing 19:4 39:18	31:14,15,18	11:17,19 12:1	Kroll 41:10	limitations 28:9
1	indicate 41:17	12:11,13,14		listed 9:1
8:7 10:2,17	indicted 23:21	41:21	L	listening 4:10
1	30:25	items 9:6	labor 34:13	16:16 41:6,25
help 7:14 19:12	indictment 22:14	. T	Lamont 2:14 7:8	literally 6:25
		XING 10	33:18,23	litigated 17:5
hereunto 44:18	individuals 13:1	JIM 2:12	Larry 6:23 7:11	litigation 8:11
hire 7:14 8:7	13:10 32:1	job 22:22 38:15	law 13:9 32:25	8:25 9:4,12,14
1 1	39:5	joined 10:13	34:18,18	9:24 34:5
hired 6:18,18	information	17:7	lawsuit 4:5,17	36:21 37:3,14
1 '	27:18,23	judge 5:22,24	4:24 5:16,25	litigator 38:15
!	initiating 9:4	6:6,7,8,10,15	6:11,19 8:3,4	little 5:3 12:19
Honor 8:10,18	initiation 8:25 9:3	6:23,24 25:15	8:21 15:24	28:21 36:19
1	•	26:1,1,1,15,16	19:20 26:25	lives 37:3
	injury 24:7	27:3 29:15,24	28:16 30:4	logical 33:22
	insert 9:21	30:6 32:25	lawyer 40:7	longer 7:5
hopefully 27:3	instance 24:3 28:24	33:13	lawyers 23:11	look 5:8 9:11
1 1		K	lead 3:8 34:17	16:10,14
1	instruct 18:23	keep 11:1 16:16	learned 40:3	looking 14:4
horsepower	instructions 23:2	16:18 28:7	leases 7:9	looks 24:9
1 1		Keren 2:4 44:6	leg 22:3	lose 6:21 7:6
1.20	intentional	1101 011 4.7 TT.U	legal 7:21 16:5	loss 24:7

		1	A A	. =
18:3 19:11,25	20:13 21:6	38:17	Opposed 42:23	22:17 24:13
17:15,18 18:1	money 19:5	19:8 35:8	opponents 5:2	20:12,16 21:16
15:21 16:4	modify 13:22	need 10:2 17:11	38:2	personal 19:3
13:6,13 15:9	missed 4:12	necessary 28:7	32:24,25 34:14	permit 10:15
10:10,18 13:3	18:16	39:19 41:17	opinion 6:16	29:25
9:5,9,16,17	misrepresenta	34:17 37:25	Open 11:19 12:2	10:4 13:9
8:14,16,21,25	minutes 29:21	necessarily	one year 25:15	permission 5:13
4:21 5:1,9,11	31:23	near 20:11	one-year 23:15	percent 33:6
3:24 4:5,8,13	mind 11:3 21:18	names 40:20	ones 14:18	people's 21:16
3:12,13,19,23	11:21 36:21,22	44:16	older 26:2,3	35:14 36:13
McGrath 2:14	million 7:25	13:10 39:5	40:13 41:23	32:20 33:24
MAYOR 2:8	Mike 14:7 16:6	named 5:22	39:10,12 40:12	23:20 30:24
matter 26:7	18:24	35:23	31:23 38:8	22:13,24 23:9
28:2	methodology	name 15:9 35:22	29:24 30:8,19	20:12,21 21:13
maneuvering -	merits 20:7	N	27:4 29:4,17	18:12 20:4,9
mandate 18:20	merge 4:2 16:9		24:18,21 25:16	13:8 17:4
31:11,13	30:19 39:4	22:19	21:22,23 24:15	7:20,21 9:25
Manager's	merely 11:23	MP-3 12:25	15:20 16:15	people 5:4.14
2:14	14:6 29:7	26:24	12:19 13:5,12	33:22
MANAGER	mentioned 9:5	MP-2 23:1 25:5	8:15 12:3,8,16	pension 23:8
26:2 32:20	memo 9:19	26:24 30:21	okay 3:18 8:15	penalty 39:5
man 6:10 9:25	41:10	24:24 25:5	Oh 8:12	33:21 36:9
7:21,22,22,23	21:2 27:18	22:20 23:1	offices 10:17	18:23 32:22
malpractice	members 20:25	MP-1 12:25	officers 34:1	pay 5:8 7:8
making 32:9	39:17 41:8	moving 28:8	office 9:24 10:15	Passes 42:25
maker 39:12	meeting 3:4	moved 4:22	object 18:8	party 16:8
main 8:4 20:22	mediate 7:1	28:17	0	parts 13:24
42:22	media 41:10,19	12:4 25:21		44:15
40:18 41:2	meant 13:6	move 6:13 11:4	8:19 42:13	parties 10:14
23:3,22 40:17	means 32:7	24:19 29:1	number 4:6 6:7	particular 28:24
21:24 22:6	37:20 42:6	motions 10:9	novel 36:4	2:1
2:11 21:18,23	32:17 33:13	40:13,16 42:17	noted 11:20	PARTIAL 1:11
Maienschein	25:19 27:6,23	38:21 39:11,12	notebooks 9:21	37:5 42:6
Madam 23:23	22:2,7 23:16	38:9,13,17,18	note 25:2	31:5,6,10,14
42:24	mean 6:25 15:8	26:8 37:19	normally 5:12	part 12:12 15:7
41:22,24 42:15	41:1 42:12	17:2 25:22	normal 23:19	31:16
40.17 41:5,6	39:6,7 40:25	15:8 16:18,21	noon 41:10	paragraphs
Madaffer 2:12	35:3 38:12,14	12:17 13:19,21	night 41:12	paragraph 24:5
M 2:4 44:6,22	33:17 34:12	11:6,23 12:9	26:2 27:21	pages 14:3 17:23
M	32:16 33:11,15	10:21,22 11:4	nice 6:10 10:4	page 31:11,13
	30:19 31:7,9	motion 5:11	29:6,7 38:23	P
low 6:7	29:9,12 30:14	6:2	11:8,24 19:20	
loved 4:13	26:21 28:4,19	morning 5:15,23	new 8:21 10:16	o'clock 41:9
love 37:12	26:5,8,11,18	moot 13:7	never 6:17 13:8	outcome 44:17
37:8,9 42:8	25:1,8,12,21	months 19:1	negotiated 14:10	ought 38:4
27:19 36:6	23:7 24:14	37:10	18:18	28:13
lot 10:10 17:5,7	21:4,9 22:5,12	32:19,21 33:21 34:3 36:9 37:8	needs 10:11,21 negligence 18:15	opposition 43:1 order 3:4 10:9
1 -	20:3,8,15 21:1			

	<u> </u>	1	1	1
personally 20:21	prefer 28:4	22:25 24:23,25	receivership	researchwise
21:16	present 7:13	25:4,4 38:23	9:17 42:7	15:12
Peters 2:9 4:9,12	18:14 21:1,2	purposes 12:16	recess 4:15 22:3	resolution 16:7
4:25 12:6,18	presently 6:6	pursue 13:21	recommend	19:8 37:13,16
12:19 13:5,12	11:22	40:6	10:14	38:6 39:8 42:7
13:15,23 14:19	pressed 33:1	put 7:16 25:24	record 3:5,19	respect 39:3
14:21 15:3,18	pretty 10:1	37:23 40:2	4:1 36:3 40:4	40:23 42:7
16:3,22 17:4	30:22 35:19	putting 15:10	41:16 44:13	response 21:25
17:16,21 18:2	36:25	38:13	recover 20:9	23:4
19:3,23 20:1,6	previous 37:3	p.m 2:2 3:1 43:4	21:6	rest 12:25 13:24
20:23 21:2,5	previously 40:5		reference 31:15	17:18,22 19:10
22:1 23:24	prior 16:1 30:21	Q	referred 8:21	restate 18:22
24:2,15 26:4	40:10	question 12:6	9:1	result 10:19
29:3 35:16,17	privilege 41:12	27:4 29:5	reflects 39:2	15:5,6 16:10
38:18,25 39:10	probably 6:24	31:21,23 32:5	Registered 44:8	18:21 24:6
39:14,16,25	16:14 18:25	34:25 37:17,18	reinstate 20:14	retain 11:10,25
40:19 42:21	21:7 22:21	37:22 40:6	rel 15:14	38:23
Peter's 29:2	35:10	42:19	related 41:21	retained 6:1
34:13	problem 14:7	questions 12:7,8	released 41:9,18	retired 32:2
picking 6:9	17:10 37:22	24:18 30:9	relief 13:16,24	retirees 32:12
plain 30:9	proceed 10:15	42:8,9	16:25 18:4,5,6	35:1
plaintiff 15:23	40:9	quick 24:22	18:7 21:10,12	retirement 11:9
16:12 25:13	proceeding 1:10	34:11	22:17 23:1	34:9 36:17
plans 32:3,3	44:13,16	quite 28:12	25:23 27:1	retroactive 34:2
play 30:5	PROCEEDIN	R	29:13,13 30:19	retweak 22:18
plead 14:11	2:1	rainbow 7:3	31:17,18,19	rid 13:2 22:16
22:17 31:16	Professional	raise 33:20	36:18 37:21	26:12 32:8
pleading 14:23	44:8	raising 8:22	39:4	right 13:15
17:8 35:25	professionals	28:6 33:19	rely 24:11 28:11	15:20 16:3
please 5:8	9:1,4 23:17	ranks 33:24	28:12	25:3 27:14
pled 15:19 18:11	Proposal 31:11	read 17:19	remedies 40:1	28:13 29:14
19:2,14,14	31:13	29:21	remember 14:2	33:14 35:17
22:18 24:5,10	proposed 11:12	real 7:9 36:12	27.16,19	38:24
26:22,22 29:20	prosecute 11:23	realize 31:16	renegotiate 33:4	risk 14:8
30:14,15 40:1	15:4,25 38:21	really 13:7	report 9:3,11	risky 23:16
Plus 28:5	prosecution	18:12 24:22,24	36:14	road 35:7,12
point 7:6 10:12	11:7,7 12:13	24:25 25:6,6	reported 1:24	Rodder 9:12
13:25 16:2	prospects 9:12	28:22 32:14	44:10	Ron 21:6
21:18,19 33:6	9:14	35:8 37:15	Reporter 2:5	roof 36:7
40:20	protect 21:7	42:4,5,9	44:7,8	roofer 36:7
police 34:1	22:3,11 31:4	reason 8.7 10.7	REPORTER'S	room 4:11,20
position 6:13	prove 24:8	17:22 22:2	44:1	22:20 33:2
14:9,12 16:23	provided 8:13	26:13,21 35:21	reports 9:10	35:5
potential 10:9	9:9,15 34:20	39:25	represent 7:1	RPR 44:22
10:22 11:6,21	proximate 24:6	reasons 25:25	requested 38:25	rudder 7:20
13:21 28:9	public 36:13	receiver 7:16	requires 28:17	rule 6:7
power 9:25	37:10,16 41:10	39:17 40:2	research 34:15	ruling 25:18
practices 34:13	purpose 11:25	37.11 70.2	36:6	26:17 36:25

	· .	1		1
rulings 29:23	sense 28:10 30:8	34:6	suggesting 13:18	testimony 44:10
run 4:16 8:6	41:13,18	someday 33:21	suing 13:1 22:23	Thank 3:18
10:6 23:15	sent 9:20	soon 36:25 38:7	suit 26:14,15	14:15 21:24
running 8:6	separate 25:14	sorry 8:15,18	Sunday 4:17	23:22,23,25
	separately 39:23	10:23 13:3	support 13:16	29:4 40:18
\mathbf{S}	serious 27:2	28:1 39:14	13:23,24 15:1	41:4 42:16
safe 39:7	30:23	41:24	42:2	theory 36:4
San 1:9,13 2:3,8	serve 4:23	sort 22:2 37:14	sure 6:2 12:10	they'd 23:18
3:1 16:6 25:14	served 4:23 13:8	source 36:5	21:14 23:3	thing 7:17 15:18
44:3	service 11:7	spend 36:21	24:23 27:11	19:11 22:18
sat 37:13	services 11:22	spending 19:5	32:15 34:2	25:11 27:22
Sathoff 21:4,6	session 1:10 2:1	37:8,11	38:20 40:12	28:15 29:19
22:12,24 23:9	3:4 4:20 8:20	spirit 42:3	surface 41:13	33:2,4 35:19
24:4	8:24 9:2,7,8,8	squeeze 34:6	sworn 44:10	36:13 40:5
Sathoffs 18:11	11:9,20 12:2	start 3:22 16:18		things 11:1 31:1
saying 15:22	12:11 27:21	35:11 38:16	\mathbf{r}	37:5,17 38:4
20:8,10,13	set 16:12 20:16	state 2:5 3:21	Tab 8:11,16	think 3:19.4:21
26:17-29:15	20:18 44:18	15:4 44:4,7	9:11,14	7:5 9:16 10:20
32:4 40:1	setting-15:25	stated 40:13	table 35:14 37:4	11:15:13:13
says 20:17 29:13	settle 6:22 33:17	statement 41:16	37:15	14:6,11,22,25
31:10 34:18	settlement 6:24	statute 4:16,21	tabs 8:23 9:11	14:25 15:19
35:23 37:25	Shorthand 2:4	8:5 10:6 19:14	take 16:22 28:2	16:4,13 17:4,7
scare 6:20	44.6	19:17 20:19	34:7,7 35:18	17:10 19:7,8
scared 10:5	side 23:6,7 29:16	22:2,4,11,21	taken 16:4 34:19	20:6,21:11
Scott 2:9 16:13	29:17,17 30:21	23:14,15 26:23	39:19	22:12,20 23:5
22:16 30:15,16	31:4 32:13	28:9,9 30:5	takes 14:12.17:7	23:5,7.26:7,16
Scott's 25:22	sides 37:11	statutes 8:6	talk 5:25 24:17	26:25 27:12
scream 6:20	significant	stay 33:10	37:5 38:3	28:5,13,22,23
SDCERS 4:5	35:19	stipulating 37:6	talked 30:11	30:3 32:5
5:15,18 13:10	similar 34:20	37:6	37:13	33:18 35:3,7
16:9 18:22	simple 5:11 10:1	stop 5:6:26:23	talking 14:17,19	35:23,24,25
25:13 29:10	11:1,4 16:19	stopped 19:14	16:17 20:23	36:1,4,11,12
second 8:7 12:17	simply 16:18	strategy 28:23	33:12 38:4	36:16 37:18
18:1,3 26:21	single 35:10	strategy 23:23 street 2:3 32:25	talks 5:20	38:3 42:3,12
27:17 42:17	sir 5:10 22:5	strongly 10:14	tape 41:14	thinking 33:17
seconded 16:21	25:8	stuff 19:6 27:2	tax 7:9	thinks 6:21
17:2 38:9	sitting 41:8,25	37:9	taxes 7:8 33:20	Third 36:14
seconder 40:15	42:2	subject 23:18	taxing 33:19	thought 34:12
secondly 41:2	situation 32:11	41:11 43:3	television 4:10	41:14,15
Sections 12:20	35:6	substantial 24:7	tell 6:18 7:17	•
see 15:18 21:5	sixes 23:9	successful 15:15	13:6 18:25	three 4:21 9:6
-22:12 37:2,13	smash 27:2	sudden 32:3	19:12 23:13	three-year 4:16
37:15 38:11,19	Smith 9:13	42:4	29:16 30:4	20:19 28:8
seeing 38:13		sued 23:9 36:17	31:2,2,10	throwing 29:15
seeking 39:5	smoothly 38:5		32:16,24	time 8:5 12:22, /
selected 18:24	solelŷ 39:23	suffered 24:7	telling 3:8	12:23 14:6
sell 7:9	solve 35:15	suggest 6:5 10:9	terms 38:8	20:8 28:16
send 6:14	somebody 6:3	11:18	terribly 15:14	35:19
SOUTH CALLET	6:21 7:11 33:1	suggested 13:20	1611103y 15:14	timely 20:14
			l .	

			-	
26:22	U .	16:22,23,24,25	wherewithal	34:10 35:18
timing 28:6	unanswered	16:25 17:5,8	10:1	42:21
tired 28:20	42:8	17:19,19 19:21	Wickersham	72.21
title 15:15	undermanned	21:16,20 22:23	5:22,24 6:10	1
today 8:16 11:16	7:13	22:25 23:19,20	25:15	12:93:5,209:14
39:21 41:8	understand	27:6,7,8 28:1	willing 13:15	10:12 12:20
42:2	15:22 18:7	28:11 29:1,17	15:3 22:7,8	18:4 31:11,16
today's 12:11	19:22 23:4	33:5,12 35:17	witness 44:18	31:17
told 5:2	24:2 30:16,17	35:21,22,25	words 22:8	10 18:18
tolled 22:2	34:10 36:6	36:20,20,20,25	28:18	1090 4:16 19:18
tolling 19:23	understood	37:5,7,14	work 15:17 17:3	26:23 30:5,25
20:1 22:7,10	21:25	39:19	38:11	1092 19:18
23:4,6,10,18	unfair 34:13	wanted 16:17	works 38:13	20:17
tomorrow 5:15	unfunded 35:10	22:19 25:25	world 6:24	11 18:19 31:13
5:23 6:2	unions 5:23 7:6	26:11 35:21	worth 7:24,25	12 18:20 32:22
TONI 2:8,10	31:2,4 33:3	36:17	21:8	41:9
TONY 2:10	University 3:21	wanting 39:15	wouldn't 5:4	12th 2:3
tool 37:4	upside 32:17	wants 21:9,10	8:17 22:14	12478 1:24 44:8
tough 32:9	urge 35:11	wasn't 4:11 27:5	23:11 34:8	15 32:22
transcribed .	use 21:10	way 6:9 10:20	writ 18:20	1996 27:13
44:11	Tall	15:12 16:11	write 22:8	
TRANSCRIPT	V	18:21 21:10	wrong 27:15	22
1:11 2:1	Vacant 2:9,12	22:15 24:10	31:3	2 1:12 2:3,9 3:1
Transcription	valid 35:13	25:19 27:3	. Addition the control of the contro	3:22 4:1,7,8
44:12	validate 24:10	30:6,15 31:19	<u> </u>	8:9,20 9:7,11
tremendous	validity 12:24	33:11 35:4,15	yeah 8:14 14:21	12:13,20,24
36:14	12:25 13:17	37:20 38:1	21:5 23:18	18:5 24:24
trial 6:15 24:8	39:24	44:16	26:9 27:21	31:13,18
tried 15:12	value 34:20	week 5:15 8:13	29:11 38:11	20 32:22
trimmed 39:1	various 9:1,10	9:9,16 25:13	41.1,22	2002 14:17,19
40:22	versa 30:2	40:10,10	year 7:4 36:21	30:23
true 26:4 37:9	versus 25:13	week's 4:3	years 4:22 6:19	2005 1:12 2:3
44:13	view 19:4	weren't 27:20	16:2 23:15	3:1 14:19,20
trust 18:9 24:3	visa 30:2	we'll 9:18 11:25	32:22 42:13	202 2:3
42:15	void 19:18 23:2	34:8 35:14	yell 6:20	23rd 5:14
Trustees 3:21	26:23	37:10	yelling 33:3	3
trusting 42:5	voided 31:1,6,8	we're 3:19,22	yesterday 41:15	32:10 3:6 12:21
try 16:18 35:12	vote 22:16 42:1	7:10 8:12	young 2:10 6:17	12:24 18:6
36:24	voted 36:1	15:14 22:21	16:20 20:2	30 6:19
trying 16:12	voting 27:16	24:17 25:6	21:21,22 23:25	30 0.17
20:19 22:21	42:10	26:13,14 27:3	24:21,22 25:3	4
25:1,6 28:2	W	32:4 33:3 34:1	25:9,16 26:9	42:10 3:6 9:18
Tuesday 2:2		35:19 39:4,20	26:13,19 27:4	11:17 18:7
two 25:20,22	wait 4:19 10:5	we've 15:12 19:2	27:11,14,22	
27:6	waiver 41:12	22:18 29:19	28:1 29:5,11	5
type 9:25	walls 7:20 8:1	32:17 34:15	30:8,16 31:5,8	52:11 3:6 18:9
Typing 26:6	want 12:23 14:5	36:15 40:2	31:21 32:20	5-1 42:25
-	14:23 15:23,25	whereof 44:18	33.8,13,16	5:24 2:2 3:1
414.540000 34444. 1444. 24500.				l

6				and the state of t
62:11 3:6 4:2,7				
4:8 8:8,16,24				
9:8 11:10 12:11,14 18:10				
6:09 43:4				
60 33:6				
61 31:16	,			
7				
72:12 3:6,21				To specify the specific the specifi
18:15 42:25 70 33:6	·			
i -			;	10 d
8 8 2:12 8:11 9:2,8		* . *		
8 2:12 8:11 9:2,8 18:16				
80 24:5				
•		-		# Control of the Cont
9.	•			1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
710.17, 51.11	••			Charles of the Control of the Contro
				1114
			٠.	. P. T. 5.99 a. 155

		·		
	se			
				200
				The second secon
				1.00
·				
				-
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				4,650.1 Life
	-			
				W 127 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 4